UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,088	06/29/2001	James Russell Boykin	AUS920010498US1	6706

35525	7590	03/30/2004

DUKE W. YEE
CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P.
P.O. BOX 802334
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER
TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/895,088	BOYKIN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Mylinh T Tran	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin et

al. [US. 5,862,379] in view of Zellweger [US. 6,243,700].

As to claims 1, 23 and 44, Rubin et al. discloses responsive to selection of an object,

determining an object type of the selected object (column 2, lines 1-24, "in response to

input from the user, selecting a first object classes; in response to the user using the

input device to draw a first visual representation on the display screen, generating a

source object"); determining actions which can be performed on the object type by other

objects in a data processing system at the time of selection (column 10, line 60 through

column 11, line 15); and associating the determined actions with the selected object

(figure 10A, column 2, lines 1-24, visual representation displaying teaches as the list of

action displaying). The difference between Rubin et al. and the claim is generating

menu files at a runtime. Zellweger shows the limitation at column 2, line 52 through

column 3, line 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having

the teachings of Rubin et al. and Zellweger before them at the time the invention was

made to modify the selected object type as taught by Rubin et al. to include the actions

associated with the selected object of Zellweger, with the motivation of being to let a

program user to select and perform a desired action as taught by Zellweger.

As to claims 2 and 24, Zellweger also discloses querying the selected object for a runtime list of actions from a database (column 2, line 65 through column 3, line 2 and column 7, lines 31-47); retrieving a static list of methods/actions for the object type (column 4, lines 42-52); and combining the runtime list, static list, and actions by other objects to produce a combined list of actions for the object (column 4, lines 12-24).

As to claims 3, 4, 16, 25-26 and 39, Rubin et al. shows the determining steps being performed on a Java class (column 5, lines 4-16).

As to claims 5 and 27, Zellweger also shows object is graphical user interface object -representative of a network resource and the combined list of actions is presented in the interface to a user (column 4, lines 1-24).

As to claims 6 and 28, Zellweger shows providing a static list of actions for a specific class (column 5, lines 55-65).

As to claims 7, 29, 41, 45 and 47, the claims are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 except for the feature of "dynamically associating actions with the object based on an object type of the object". Rubin shows it at figure 10A, column 2, lines 1-24;

As to claims 8 and 30, Rubin et al. teaches the selection being made using a pointing device (column 4, lines 52-59).

As to claims 9 and 31, Rubin et al. also teaches wherein the pointing device being a mouse (column 4, lines 48-57).

As to claims 10-11 and 32-33, Rubin et al. provides the actions being presented as a pop-up menu and the actions being presented as at least one of a selectable list (figure 10A, 140).

As to claims 12 and 34, while Rubin et al. teaches selection of each type of the object, Zellweger shows the actions being dynamically associated in response to the selection of the object (column 4, lines 42-57).

As to claims 13 and 35-36, Zellweger teaches the actions being dynamically associated when the object is initialized (column 4, lines 32-43).

As to claims 14 and 37, Zellweger also teaches adding a new action to the actions prior to dynamically associating the actions (column 6, lines 44-58).

As to claims 15 and 38, Zellweger provides changing to the actions result in only existing actions are presented (column 4, lines 42-50).

As to claims 17, 40 and 46, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 except for the feature of "wherein a hard coded association between the associated actions and the object are absent, not extensible and undesirable". Zellweger teaches this feature at column 6, lines 18-57.

As to claims 18 and 42, Zellweger demonstrates the object being a folder and wherein the program is a file navigation program (column 2, lines 52-60).

As to claims 19 and 43, Rubin et al. teaches the object being a security object (column 16, lines 37-68).

As to claim 20, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 7 and 17.

As to claim 22, the claim is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 except for the feature of "a bus system, a communications unit connected to the bus system and a memory connected to the bus system". Rubin et al. shows the limitation at column 4, lines 40-60.

As to claim 42, Zellweger shows the object being a folder and wherein the program

being a file navigation program (column 4, lines 1-20).

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and

Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-

7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-4395 for Official

communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A

Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile

communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or

"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,

Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-

1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8.00AM to

4.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file.

PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a

possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record

includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35

U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published

in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG

89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)

305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2174

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100